



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/898,677	07/03/2001	Gregory Stuart Snider	10003302-1	1745

7590 11/10/2004
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	<p>Application No.</p> <p align="center">09/898,677</p>	<p>Applicant(s)</p> <p align="center">SNIDER, GREGORY STUART</p>	
	<p>Examiner</p> <p align="center">Benjamin R Bruckart</p>	<p>Art Unit</p> <p align="center">2155</p>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20010703</u>.</p> | <p>4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____</p> <p>5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</p> <p>6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p> |
|--|---|

Detailed Action

Claims 1-24 are pending in this Office Action.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed on 7/3/01 has been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. In claim 1, the applicant claims a communications network with software modules but does not define within the body of the claim the hardware in which the invention runs. The file system is treated as operating system software as described in the specification and the machine user is not a part of the invention, just an entity in which it communicates with. In claim 12, the web site is directed to a plurality of software modules but there is no hardware in which the software runs.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2155

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 13, 17, 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2001/0013051 by Nakada et al.

Regarding claim 1, a communications network (Nakada: page 5, para 70), comprising:

- a server software module adapted to communicate with a machine user (Nakada: page 5, para 70; Figure 1);

- an agent communication language (ACL) interpreter adapted to communicate with the server software module (Nakada: page 6, para 79-80, 84; page 7; para 89; interpreter interprets ACL between agents);

- a file system adapted to communicate with the ACL interpreter (Nakada: page 6, para 78), wherein the machine user sends requests to the server software module using an ACL with Status Query Language (SQL) as a constraint language (Nakada: page 6, para 80; page 7; para 89).

Regarding claim 3, the communication network as claimed in claim 1 wherein the server software module is adapted to communicate with a human user (Nakada: page 6, para 75).

Regarding claim 5, the communications network as claimed in claim 1 wherein the machine user comprises a computer system selected from the group consisting of a mainframe computer, a workstation, a server, and a personal computer (Nakada: page 6, para 76).

Regarding claim 7, the communications network as claimed in claim 1 wherein the ACL comprises Knowledge Query and Manipulation Language (KQML) (Nakada: page 7, para 89).

Art Unit: 2155

Regarding claim 8, the communications network as claimed in claim 1 wherein the ACL comprises a Foundation for Intelligent Physical Agents (FIPA) agent communication language (Nakada: page 7, para 89).

Regarding claim 9, the communications network as claimed in claim 1 wherein the file system is a database system (Nakada: page 6, para 78 and 84).

Regarding claim 13, a method of information transfer for a communications network (Nakada: page 5, para 70; Figure 1), comprising:

- sending a first request from a machine user to a server software module using an agent communication language (ACL) with Status Query Language (SQL) as a constraint language (Nakada: page 6, para 80; page 7, para 89);

- sending a second request from the server software module to an ACL interpreter in response to the first request (Nakada: page 6, para 80, 84; page 8, para 107); and

- sending a third request from the ACL interpreter to a file system in response to the second request (Nakada: page 8, para 107-110).

Regarding claim 17, the method as claimed in claim 13 wherein the machine user includes a computer system selected from the group consisting of a mainframe computer, a workstation, a server, and a personal computer (Nakada: page 6, para 76).

Regarding claim 19, the method as claimed in claim 13 wherein the sending of the first request from the machine user to the server software module using an agent communication language (ACL) uses Knowledge Query and Manipulation Language (KQML) (Nakada: page 7, para 89).

Regarding claim 20, the method as claimed in claim 13 wherein the sending of the first request from the machine user to the server software module using an agent

Art Unit: 2155

communication language (ACL) uses a Foundation for Intelligent Physical Agents (FIPA) agent communication language (Nakada: page 7, para 89).

Regarding claim 21, the method as claimed in claim 13 wherein the sending of the third request from the ACL interpreter to a file system sends the third request to a database system (Nakada: page 6, para 84).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 6, 10-11, 15-16, 18, 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2001/0013051 by Nakada et al in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0122063 by Weinberg et al.

Regarding claim 2,

The Nakada reference teaches the communications network as claimed in claim 1.

The Nakada reference does not explicitly state the server software is a web server.

The Weinberg reference teaches a server software module is a Web server software module (Weinberg: pages 8 and 9, para 121 and 122; server and client).

The Weinberg reference further teaches the invention provides organized and filtered data to users access without regard to time or geographic location overcoming problems of time consumption and confusion (Weinberg: page 1, para 2-3).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the communications network as taught by Nakada while employing a web server as taught by Weinberg in order to provide organized and filtered data to users access without regard to time or geographic location overcoming problems of time consumption and confusion (Weinberg: page 1, para 2-3).

Art Unit: 2155

Claims 6, 10-11 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set forth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Weinberg et al and Nakada.

Regarding claim 6, the communications network as claimed in claim 1 wherein the machine user sends requests to the server software module using the ACL with eXtensible Markup Language (XML) for syntax (Weinberg: page 11, para 159).

Regarding claim 10, the communications network as claimed in claim 1 further including a Common Gateway Interface (CGI) script adapted to communicate with the file system (Weinberg: page 10, para 138-139; Figure 18).

Regarding claim 11, the communications network as claimed in claim 10 wherein the ACL interpreter is adapted to communicate with the file system via the CGI script (Weinberg: page 10, para 138-139; Figure 18).

Regarding claim 15,

The Nakada reference teaches the method as claimed in claim 13.

The Nakada reference does not explicitly state the server software is a web server.

The Weinberg reference teaches a server software module is a Web server software module (Weinberg: pages 8 and 9, para 121 and 122; server and client).

The Weinberg reference further teaches the invention provides organized and filtered data to users access without regard to time or geographic location overcoming problems of time consumption and confusion (Weinberg: page 1, para 2-3).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the communications network as taught by Nakada while employing a web server as taught by Weinberg in order to provide organized and filtered data to users access without regard to time or geographic location overcoming problems of time consumption and confusion (Weinberg: page 1, para 2-3).

Art Unit: 2155

Claims 16, 18, 22-23 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set forth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Weinberg et al and Nakada.

Regarding claim 16, the method as claimed in claim 13 further including: sending a request from a human user to the server software module using Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) (Weinberg: page 9, para 123).

Regarding claim 18, the method as claimed in claim 13 wherein the sending of the first request from the machine user to the server software module uses the ACL with eXtensible Markup Language (XML) for syntax (Weinberg: page 11, para 159).

Regarding claim 22, the method as claimed in claim 13 further including sending a fourth request from the ACL interpreter to a Common Gateway Interface (CGI) script in response to the second request (Weinberg: page 9, para 134).

Regarding claim 23, the method as claimed in claim 22 further including sending a fifth request from the CGI script to the file system (Weinberg: page 10, para 138-139).

Claims 4, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2001/0013051 by Nakada et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,490,564 by Dodrill et al.

Regarding claim 4,

The Nakada reference teaches the communication network as claimed in claim 1.

The Nakada reference does not explicitly state the use of PHP or DLLs but does teach the file system integrated on the server and client sides.

The Dodrill reference teaches a server software module including PHP and DLL modules adapted to communicate with the file system (Dodrill: col. 13, lines 20-35, 56-61).

Art Unit: 2155

The Dodrill reference further teaches the libraries enable the runtime environment to implement the procedures as specified (Dodrill: col. 13, lines 59-61).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the communications network as taught by Nakada while employing DLL and PHP as taught by Dodrill in order to enable the runtime environment to implement the procedures as specified (Dodrill: col. 13, lines 59-61).

Regarding claim 14,

The Nakada reference teaches the method as claimed in claim 13.

The Nakada reference does not explicitly state the use of PHP or DLLs but does teach the file system integrated on the server and client sides.

The Dodrill reference teaches a server software module including PHP and DLL modules adapted to communicate with the file system (Dodrill: col. 13, lines 20-35, 56-61).

The Dodrill reference further teaches the libraries enable the runtime environment to implement the procedures as specified (Dodrill: col. 13, lines 59-61).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the communications network as taught by Nakada while employing DLL and PHP as taught by Dodrill in order to enable the runtime environment to implement the procedures as specified (Dodrill: col. 13, lines 59-61).

Claims 12, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0122063 by Weinberg et al in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0013051 by Nakada et al in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,490,564 by Dodrill et al.

Regarding claim 12,

The Weinberg reference teaches a Web site (Weinberg: pages 8 and 9, para 121 and 122) comprising:

a Web server software module adapted to communicate with a machine user (Weinberg: pages 8 and 9, para 121 and 122; server and client), wherein the machine user includes a computer system selected from the group consisting of a mainframe computer,

Art Unit: 2155

a workstation, a server, and a personal computer (Weinberg: pages 9 and 10, para 134; Figure 1), the Web server software module including a PHP module (Weinberg: page 10, para 134);

a database system adapted to communicate, wherein the machine user sends requests to the server software module with Status Query Language (SQL) as a constraint language and extensible Markup Language (XML) for syntax (Weinberg: page 9-10, para 134, 159); and

a Common Gateway Interface (CGI) script adapted to communicate with the database system (Weinberg: page 10, para 138-139; Figure 18).

The Weinberg reference does not explicitly state Direct Link Library or ACL interpreter but does teach interpreting the CGI files requests and responding with output.

The Nakada reference teaches an agent communication language (ACL) interpreter adapted to communicate with the Web server software module (Nakada: page 6, para 79-80, 84; page 7; para 89; interpreter interprets ACL between agents).

The Nakada reference further teaches the invention overcomes prior art problems and creates flexible and smooth information exchange and coordination among agents (Nakada: page 1, para 7).

The Dodrill reference teaches a server software module including PHP and DLL modules adapted to communicate with the file system (Dodrill: col. 13, lines 20-35, 56-61).

The Dodrill reference further teaches the libraries enable the runtime environment to implement the procedures as specified (Dodrill: col. 13, lines 59-61).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the Web server as taught by Weinberg while employing DLL and PHP and ACL as taught by Dodrill and Nakada in order to enable the runtime environment to implement the procedures as specified (Dodrill: col. 13, lines 59-61) and create a flexible and smooth information exchange and coordination among agents (Nakada: page 1, para 7).

Art Unit: 2155

Regarding claim 24, a method of information transfer for a Web site (Weinberg: pages 8 and 9, para 121 and 122), comprising:

- sending a first request from a machine user to a Web server software module using an agent communication language (ACL) with Status Query Language (SQL) as a constraint language and extensible Markup Language (XML) for syntax (Weinberg: page 9-10, para 134, 159), wherein the machine user comprises a computer system selected from the group consisting of a mainframe computer, a workstation, a server, and a personal computer (Weinberg: pages 9 and 10, para 134; Figure 1), the Web server software module including a PHP module (Weinberg: page 10, para 134);

- sending a request to a Common Gateway Interface (CGI) script in response to the second request (Weinberg: page 10, para 138-139); and

- sending a fifth request from the CGI script to the database system (Weinberg: page 10, para 144)

The Weinberg reference does not explicitly state Direct Link Library or ACL interpreter but does teach interpreting the CGI files requests and responding with output.

The Nakada reference teaches an agent communication language (ACL) interpreter adapted to communicate with the Web server software module (Nakada: page 6, para 79-80, 84; page 7; para 89; interpreter interprets ACL between agents);

- sending a second request from the server software module to an ACL interpreter in response to the first request (Nakada: page 6, para 80, 84; page 8, para 107); and

- sending a third request from the ACL interpreter to a file system in response to the second request (Nakada: page 6, para 84).

The Nakada reference further teaches the invention overcomes prior art problems and creates flexible and smooth information exchange and coordination among agents (Nakada: page 1, para 7).

The Dodrill reference teaches a server software module including PHP and DLL modules adapted to communicate with the file system (Dodrill: col. 13, lines 20-35, 56-61).

The Dodrill reference further teaches the libraries enable the runtime environment to implement the procedures as specified (Dodrill: col. 13, lines 59-61).

Art Unit: 2155

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the Web server as taught by Weinberg while employing DLL and PHP and ACL as taught by Dodrill and Nakada in order to enable the runtime environment to implement the procedures as specified (Dodrill: col. 13, lines 59-61) and create a flexible and smooth information exchange and coordination among agents (Nakada: page 1, para 7).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R Bruckart whose telephone number 571-272-3982. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30 PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-3982.

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155

brb

November 1, 2004



HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER